

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 21 2007

REMARKS

The Office Action of 02/27/2007 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 were rejected as being anticipated by Clark. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite a serial memory element in which successive data elements are shifted in order from one memory location to a next successive memory location, and a parallel memory element coupled to the serial memory element, the serial memory element comprising at least one memory location more for the data signals than the parallel memory element. Clark is not believed to teach or suggest any such combination of features.

In Clark, successive data elements are written to different columns of a FIFO to form rows of data elements. Data is then shifted from row to row. A row in Clark, however, is not the same as the serial memory element of claim 1, in that *successive* data elements are not shifted in order from one memory location to a next successive memory location. Rather, in Clark, every *nth* data element (e.g., 4<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup>) is written to the same row. The data elements written to a given row are not successive. Therefore, Clark at least fails to teach the claimed serial memory element of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-10 are also believed to add novel and patentable subject matter to claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-10 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 05/25/2007